



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,601	09/16/2005	Mathijs Theodorus Van De Ven	3135-048013	9486

7590 01/30/2009
William H Logsdon
Webb Ziesenheim Logsdon Orkin & Hanson
436 Seventh Avenue
700 Koppers Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818

EXAMINER

PRASAD, CHANDRIKA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/519,601

Applicant(s)VAN DE VEN, MATTHJS
THEODORUS**Examiner**

CHANDRIKA PRASAD

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/04/08.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 19-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are confusing. The independent claim 19 refers to a line sensor as being the invention but the dependent claims refer to a gripping means as being the invention. It is not clear what the invention is.

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claim 1 fails to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the title, the abstract and the specification which clearly indicate that the invention is about a gripping means not a line sensor and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in claim 19.

Note: For the reasons cited above, this feature has been ignored.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 19-24 and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berthold et al. (4976157).

Berthold (Figure 2) shows a gripping means for a line sensor for gripping a signal line 15 comprising at least one rigid component 26 adapted to grip a sleeve 14 of a signal line (an optical cable) 15 wherein the gripping means includes a spring element made of a flexible material, which engages and exerts a biasing force on the rigid component and away from the signal line to remove load of or loads on the rigid component. The spring element is embodied as a resilient sleeve on which the rigid component is placed. The spring element is placed between two rigid components 26. The rigid components are fastened for fastening the gripping means to the signal line. An edge of the rigid component is at right angles to the centre line of the signal line. The gripping means can be released or partially released from the signal line. The gripping means is at least partially combined with the sleeve. The gripping means is provided with a holding member 34 and is remote from the side connected to the signal line. The signal line is influenced by loads on the signal line. The signal line passes in a smooth line in the gripping means. The rigid component forms part of the sleeve. The signal line is embodied in a flexible sealing element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berthold et al. (4976157) in view of Hinze (5703754).

Berthold discloses all the features of these claims except the hardness of the rigid component being between 10 to 100 shores. Materials of such hardness are well known. Hinze discloses the use of materials with such hardness. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make the rigid component of hardness between 10 to 100 shores as taught by Hinze, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

10. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad at (571) 272-2099. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is 571-273-8300.

/Chandrika Prasad/
Primary examiner
January 26, 2009